

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Remarks on the Amendments

Claims 4-5 and 9-11 have been canceled, because they become redundant after the amendments.

Claims 1-2, 7-8 and 12-13 have been amended to more specifically define Applicants' claimed invention.

New claims 14-20 have been added. Antecedent basis of the amendments and the new claims can be found in the Specification and claims as filed.

More specifically, the antecedent basis for the amendments of Claims 1-2, 8 and 13 can be found on page 3, lines 10-16, on page 5, line 1, on page 9, line 16, and Figs. 1, 2, 9, 10 and 11 of the Specification as filed. The antecedent basis for Claims 15-16 can be found on page 9, line 4 and on page 10 lines 11-12.

Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added by the amendments of the Specification and claims.

After cancellation of 4 claims, and addition of 7 claims, there are now a total of 16 claims pending. Applicants respectfully submit that no additional fee for the claims is required.

2. Response to the objections of drawings

Figs. 1, 2, 9 and 10 have been objected to as failing to comply with 37CFR 1.84(p)(4)-(5). This objection has been obviated by the amendments of drawings and the Specification.

3. Response to the Objection of the Specification

The Specification has been objected to because of certain informalities. Applicants have amended the Specification to obviate the objection.

More specifically, Applicants have amended the Specification on page 8 related to element 30. Applicants have chosen to use the definition on page 9, line 16, of the Specification as filed, throughout the specification and claims. Applicants respectfully point out that the same definition is also used in the Summary of the Invention on page 3 of the Specification as filed.

4. Response to the Rejections of Claims 1-3, 6-8 and 12-13 Based Upon 35 USC §103(a)

Claims 1-3, 6-8 and 12-13, the remaining claims and presumably new Claims 14-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsai (US 6,466,434), in view of Leman (US 6,161,944) and in view of Kam-Hoi (US 5,791,763). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 13 and 19 are independent claims, and Claims 2-3, 6-8 and 12 are dependent claims of Claim 1; Claims 14-18 are dependent claims of Claim 13; and Claim 20 is a dependent claim of Claim 19, respectively.

Applicants' invention defined by Claim 1 is a method of providing illumination to the inside of a desk top computer case during periods of work with the hardware thereof. The method includes the steps of removing a pre-existing expansion slot cover bracket from a complementary void space within a rear wall of the computer; and inserting into the void space a lamp means having, as a base thereof, a second and substantially like bracket having a surface substantially complementary to the void space of the computer rear wall, to provide lighting inside of the computer case. The method defined by Claim 19 further includes the steps of fastening the base bracket using existing securing means of the

expansion slot cover bracket.

Furthermore, Applicants' claimed invention defined by Claim 13 is a device for the illumination of an interior of a computer case, which comprises a base bracket having the general geometry of an expansion slot cover bracket; wherein the base bracket can be secured to a rear wall of the computer case using pre-existing securing means of the expansion slot cover bracket; power means with a housing secured to one surface of the base bracket; a lamp; a flexible lamp neck connected between the lamp and the power means; and switch means.

Tsai teaches a disk assembly which includes an assembly housing having a front end for inserting/retrieving therethrough a disk which stores computer-accessible data. The front panel of the disk assembly is mounted at the front end of the computer and has a slot for passing therethrough the disk. USB connectors are mounted on the front panel for electrically connecting therethrough a peripheral device to a computer case (Abstract). Tsai further teaches that the disk assembly can be a floppy disk drive or an optically accessible assembly. The optically accessible assembly can be a CD-ROM drive, a DVD-ROM drive, a CD-RW drive or a combination built with a DVD-ROM drive and a CD-RW drive (Column 2, lines 49-54). Moreover, Tsai emphasizes that an object of his invention is to provide a computer case capable of providing a USB hub in its front panel.

Tsai fails to teach Applicants' claimed lamp device for illumination of interior of a computer case. More particularly, Tsai fails to teach Applicants' claimed lamp device which has a lamp, a flexible lamp neck, power means, switches and a base bracket adaptable to a rear wall of the computer case. Tsai further fails to teach Applicants' method of providing illumination to an interior of a computer case.

The Examiner states that Tsai discloses in Fig. 2A and 2B a bracket with a tapered end and openings to install peripheral equipment and switches with a single power supply line. Applicants respectfully point out that Fig. 2A and 2B of Tsai's reference are not a part of Tsai's invention, which is clearly indicated by the

markings of "Prior Art" in both figures. Therefore, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of Tsai's teaching is not proper.

Nevertheless, Applicants' invention is not obvious in view of the prior art shown in Fig. 2A and 2B of Tsai's reference.

First, Fig. 2B is a 3.5 inches disk drive type USB hub for the front surface of the computer case, which is structurally incompatible to the rear wall, or the back of the computer case.

On the other hand, the interface type USB hub shown in Fig. 2A of the reference has an interface panel mounted on the back of the computer case having receptacles exposed from the back of the computer case. The interface panel has a standardized connection structure for the desk top computer case for expansion of computer interface with peripherals.

The Examiner is reminded of the integral structure and resulting functionality of Applicants' lamp device, not just the connection means for adapting to the computer case. Applicants' invention is directed to a device and a method for providing illumination inside a desk top computer case. The primary reference of Tsai and the prior art shown in Fig. 2A completely lack any teaching of Applicants' fundamental structural components and functionality of illumination. One ordinary skilled in the art would not be motivated by the prior art teaching to try to obtain illumination inside a computer case because the USB hub has no any relationship to illumination.

The deficiencies of the primary reference are not overcome by Leman and Kam-Hoi.

Leman teaches a laptop computer or a keyboard module which includes a retractable illumination device to illuminate a keyboard in a dimly lit environment. Leman specifically teaches that the illumination device may be located proximal to the keyboard or on a laptop display (Abstract).

It is apparent that Leman's illumination device is specifically designed for providing light near the keyboard for the user to view the keys (Column 3, lines 12-

15). Therefore, Leman's device must be positioned near the keyboard.

Kam-Hoi teaches a combined lamp and fan device for a camping purpose. The device comprises a head lamp, a fan head, a flexible arm set, a handle for hand and a base (Abstract). Kam-Hoi's base 4 holds the batteries and also connects to an external power supply. As shown in Fig. 3 and 4, the base 4 has a size substantially larger than handle 3 which has a size of a light torch. Furthermore, with its intended use, the base 4 has a sufficient size to be able to sit on the floor or other supporting surface when it is connected to an external power supply. Kam-Hoi's device which is designed for camping for hand-carrying and placement on the floor, is not for inserting into a desk top computer case where available space is very limited.

The Examiner urges that it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art to use Kam-Hoi's lighting means in an appropriate location as supported by Leman in the CPU housing with a bracket of Tsai's in order to enhance the interior illumination of the CPU.

Applicants respectfully point out that the three prior art references are not combinable in the manner suggested by the Examiner. First, Applicants' claimed void space for inserting the base bracket of the instant lamp device is created by removing a pre-existing expansion slot cover bracket which is only about 0.75 inch wide and about 4.5 inch long. Kam-Hoi's camping lighting means is substantially too bulky to be compatible with the expansion slot cover bracket and to be inserted into a computer case. Applicants' claimed lamp device is to be inserted into and secured to the inside of the computer case, and stored within the computer case (see page 10, third paragraph of the instant Specification as filed). It is apparent to those skilled in the art that such a combination of a camping lamp device with an expansion slot cover bracket, as suggested by the Examiner, is structurally incompatible with a desktop computer case.

Secondly, Leman's teaching is not combinable with the prior art shown in Tsai's and Kam-Hoi. As described previously, Leman's illumination device is

specifically designed for providing light near the keyboard for the user to view the keys, and it must be positioned near the keyboard. Since the keyboard is outside of a desktop computer case, an illumination device positioned for lighting the keyboard cannot provide lighting inside the computer case. Therefore, of itself, Leman teaches away from Applicants' claimed invention of providing illumination for the interior of a computer case.

Furthermore, if one combined Kam-Hoi's camping lamp device with the bracket shown in the prior art shown in Tsai, one could no longer adapt the lamp device to a position near the keyboard as required by Leman, because the bracket is not adaptable to a keyboard or any external purpose. If one attempt to adapt the combination to the back of the computer case where the bracket should be, one would destroy the intended function of Leman, because the lighting would not be available for the keyboard. Therefore, the references' teachings are not combinable.

It is important to understand that the "appropriate location as supported by Leman", as suggested by the Examiner, is inappropriate for Applicants' claimed method, because the lighting for a keyboard is outside of, not inside, the computer case.

Because of the apparent incompatibilities of the cited prior art references, one skilled in the art would not have any reason to combine this mutually conflicting prior art. However, even if one combines in the manner suggested by the Examiner, one would not obtain Applicants' claimed lamp device and the method of providing illumination for the interior of a computer case.

Therefore, Applicants maintain that the claimed invention, as defined by Claims 1-3, 6-8 and 12-13, and Claims 14-20 are not unobvious in view of the prior art, however combined.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1-3, 6-8 and 12-13, and presumably of new Claims 14-20, based upon 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Application No. 10/039,555
Amdt. Dated July 24, 2003
Reply to Office Action of January 2, 2003

It is therefore submitted that Claims 1-3, 6-8 and 12-13, and presumably new Claims 14-20, the pending claims, are now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. Applicants' Agent respectfully requests a direct telephone communication from the Examiner with a view toward any further action deemed necessary to place the application in final condition for allowance.

7.24.03

Date of Signature

By 

Melvin K. Silverman
Registration No. 26,234

Address correspondence to:
Melvin K. Silverman, P.C.
500 Cypress Creek Road
Suite 500
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33309
Telephone: (954) 351-7474
Facsimile: (954) 492-0087